The Sum of a
CONFERENCE
Had between
TWO DIVINES
OF THE
Church of England,
And Two
CATHOLIC LAY-GENTLEMEN.
At the Request, and for the Satisfaction of Three Persons of Quality, *August* 8. 1671.

Publisht with Allowance.

LONDON,
Printed by *Henry Hills*, Printer to the King's Most Excellent Majesty, for His Houshold and Chappel, for him and *Mathew Turner*. 1687.

The Sum of a CONFERENCE

Had between

TWO DIVINES

OF THE

Church of England.

And Two

CATHOLIC LAY-GENTLEMEN.

At the Requeſt, and for the Satisfaction of Three Perſons of Quality, *Auguſt* 8. 1671.

Publiſht with Allowance.

LONDON,

Printed by *Henry Hills*, Printer to the King's Moſt Excellent Majeſty, for His Houſhold and Chappel, for him and *Matthew Turner*. 1687.

CONFERENCE

TWO DIVINES

OF THE

Church of England.

TRINITY COLLEGE
LIBRARY
CAMBRIDGE

THE PUBLISHER TO THE READER.

SInce Printing of Conferences seems now in Vogue, I will venture to be in the new Mode; I have so good an Example of it before me, that I hope no body will take it ill if I follow it. In the Year 1676. there happen'd a Conference about Points of Religion, between some Protestant Divines, and some Roman-Catholic Gentlemen, which after a long silence, has been now lately set out the second time, in a fine Dress, and with a long Preface: This gave me the Curiosity to seek

A Relation of a Conference, *Apr.* 3. 1676.

further into thoſe Matters, and meeting accidentally with a Copy of another Conference held in 1671. *wherein ſome of the ſame Perſons were concern'd, I thought good to preſent you with it. By it's plain Expreſſions and unſtudied Diſcourſe, you may eaſily judge it to be the naked Truth of what was then ſpoken. Peruſe it, and think ſeriouſly of it.*

The

The Sum of a Conference had between Two Divines of the Church of *England*, and Two Catholic Lay-Gentlemen, at the Requeſt and for the Satisfaction of Three Perſons of Quality, *Aug.* 8. 1671.

THE Perſons for whom the Conference was intended, deſir'd the Subject might be *Schiſm.*

Subject agreed.

Drs. It is fit we preſuppoſe ſome Principles before we enter into diſpute.

Cath. Content.

Dr. 1. *Schiſm* is a wilful Separation from the Communion of the Church, without cauſe.

Cath. Tho' we know very well there can be no cauſe of Schiſm, yet we will admit (to come quickly to the Queſtion) your notion of *Schiſm* with theſe words *without cauſe* in your Definition of it.

Dr. 2. Another Principle is, Men may without Crime ſeparate from a Communion, in which they cannot continue without Sin.

Cath. Agreed.

Dr. 3. There are certain Laws antecedent to Communion,

nion, by which every particular perſon ought to judge what Communion he ought to be of, or forſake.

Cath. We do admit, that there are *external Motives* antecedent to Communion, which do induce and oblige a particular perſon to chooſe the Communion of which he ought to be a Member, and to which he ought, being a Member, to ſubmit in Faith and Government, of which every particular perſon may and ought to judge: But we do deny, that the interior Doctrins or general Practices of a Communion are ſubject to the Judgment of every particular Man; ſo that every private perſon judging this or that Doctrin or Practice to be Falſe, Heretical, or Idolatrous, (tho' the Communion, of which he is a Member, judges it Catholic and Orthodox,) has lawful cauſe to ſeparate himſelf from that Communion, without being guilty of Criminal Schiſm; for without this Diſtinction there could be no ſuch thing as *Schiſm* in the World.

Dr. You muſt prove us guilty of *Criminal Schiſm.*

Cath. We will. In the year 1517, you wilfully ſeparated from the Communion of the Church, without cauſe; *Ergo* you are Criminal Schiſmatics.

Dr. I do deny that the Separation in the year, 1517, do's concern us; nor do we think our ſelves oblig'd to defend or juſtifie it; we do only maintain, that the Church of *England* is not guilty of Criminal Schiſm.

Cath. The ſame Argument preſſes the *Church of* England, as the *Lutherans*; Let it be therefore put thus. In King *Hen.* the 8*th.* *Ed.* the 6*th.* or Queen *Elizabeths* Days (date the Birth of your Church from what time you pleaſe) you wilfully ſeparated from the Communion of the Church without cauſe; *Ergo* you, the Church of *England*, are guilty of *Criminal Schiſm.*

Dr. I deny your Antecedent, we did not ſeparate without cauſe.

Cath.

Cath. I prove it. If you had lawful cauſe, you can aſſign it; but you cannot aſſign any lawful cauſe; *Ergo* you did ſeparate without cauſe.

Dr. I will aſſign the cauſe, It was thus. In the —— Year of *Henry* the *8th.* the Parliament declared, That the Right of Reforming the Church of this Kingdom was in the King; upon which the King did reform, and upon this Reformation the Pope did Excommunicate the King and Kingdom, which Excommunication was confirm'd by another Pope in Queen *Elizabeths* days; ſo that the Pope by Excommunicating made the Schiſm, and not we by Reforming.

Cath. The Declaration above mentioned, and the Reformation thereupon, were antecedent to the Excommunication; ſo that you muſt prove that the Parliament had juſt Power and Authority to make that Declaration, and to Reform upon it, and that they did indeed Reform, and not ſpoil the Doctrin they undertook to mend; for if it had not, all its Proceedings were unjuſt and criminal; and Excommunication was but the juſt and proper Puniſhment for that Crime: And then ſure it would be reckoned very ſtrange, to ſay, That a lawful Authority puniſhing an Offender, is made guilty of the Crime it puniſhes, by inflicting that Puniſhment.

Dr. The Parliament did not aſcribe any new Power to the King; but only declar'd that the ſame was in him, which all Ages appropriated to their Kings, and was allow'd by all; And I can ſhew from time to time, that the Popes Authority has been refus'd, and his Legats forbid entrance into the Kingdom ſeveral times.

Cath. I pray ſhew ſubſtantially (if you can) that the Church of *England* before the Reformation, did never at any time accept, or (which is poſitive) did at all times refuſe the Pope all ſort of Authority and Superiority over them; elſe to quarrel ſometimes with his Authority, or

ſome

ſome part of it, or ſtop his Legats, might be juſt: For that it is poſſible for a Power which has lawful Authority, to challenge and demand ſome ſort of Authority which is more than what is lawfully his; and in ſuch caſe the Inferiors may at leaſt remonſtrate to their Superiors, if not oppoſe them in ſuch unlawful Demands; and this might be the caſe between the Pope and the King of *England* at ſome particular time: At other times Inferiors might be ſtubborn and diſobedient, and for a time deny that to their Superiors which is really due. Therefore to ſay, that the Kings of *England* did for a time oppoſe the Pope in ſome things, is not enough to prove the Declaration aforeſaid (which was univerſal, denying him all Authority whatſoever,) to be no aſcribing of new Power, but only a Declaration, that the ſame Power was in That King, which all Ages appropriated to their Kings, and was allow'd by all; but the contrary, to what is now demanded to be prov'd (and muſt be prov'd before that Declaration can excuſe the Declarers from the guilt of cauſeleſs Separation, and conſequently Criminal Schiſm, and conſequently of deſerving juſtly Excommunication) is ſo evident, that I appeal to theſe preſent worthy perſons, who are to judge in this point, whether this be not ſufficiently manifeſt from the Hiſtories which they themſelves have read, and the general Confeſſions, which they themſelves have met withal from very many even learned Proteſtants, That the Pope of *Rome* was at leaſt Patriarch of the Weſt, and, as ſuch, had Patriarchal Authority, at leaſt over the Church of *England*, and therefore was allow'd to be the proper Judge of Eccleſiaſtical Matters, the very day before the foreſaid Declaration was made; and therefore was the only proper Judge of the ſaid Declaration, and the Authors of it, whether it were well and legally made: And this ſaid Judge having judicially

cially determin'd the ſaid Declaration to be Schiſmatical, condemned it legally, and juſtly Excommunicated the Authors. Moſt certainly a Declaration made by every one, that pretends Power to make one, is not preſently lawful, becauſe it is pretended to be ſo. The late long Parliament pretended to declare, That the Supream Power of *England* was in the People, and that the ſaid People might Judge and Depoſe the King whenever he miſuſed that Power, which the People entruſted him withal; and we know what followed upon it. I hope the Doctor will not juſtifie that Declaration, nor can he ſhew a diſparity between this and the other, both being made by thoſe, who were univerſally eſteem'd, at the time they made them, Subjects and Inferiors to thoſe againſt whoſe Authority they made them, in thoſe very Points, concerning which they did then declare.

Drs. The Pope was never content to be eſteem'd barely the Patriarch of the Weſt; and there is great difference between the two Declarations, that in *Hen.* Eighth's time againſt the Pope, and that in King *Charles* the Firſt's time againſt his Majeſty.

Cath. It matters not now, whether the Pope were content or no to be barely eſteem'd Patriarch of the Weſt; if he had reaſon to challenge more, that no ways juſtifies you; Do you allow, that he was Patriarch? If you do, anſwer the difficulty; and ſay, how his Inferiors came by a Power to Depoſe him; and as to the difference between the two Declarations, you muſt ſhew it us, before we believe there is any.

Gentlemen to the Doctors.

Sirs, we do not doubt, but that the Pope was allow'd ſome Authority in *England* before the Separation, we do not therefore deſire to diſpute that; but ſuppoſing he had not, you ſeparated your ſelves from the great Body of

all Christians United before in one Communion, we desire to know what cause you could have for that.

Drs. We had cause to separate, for that the Communion from which we separated, taught false Faith, and were guilty of Idolatry; I instance particularly in their Doctrin of Transubstantiation, and their Adoring the Host.

Cath. To the Company.

Tho' you may be pleas'd to remember, that we did at first deny, that any particular person, (and the same holds of particular Dioceses, Provinces, and Nations, all which United make but one Catholic Church, and therefore the biggest of them all to be consider'd only as a Member of the whole Body) has Power to judge, and condemn the Doctrins and Practices of the whole Church as false or Idolatrous, when the Body against this Member says, that the said Doctrins or Practices are Orthodox and Catholic, so as to have lawful cause to separate from the said whole Communion, without being guilty of criminal Schism; That what we said of a particular Person, holds to a Nation, or any Inferior Authority to a Superior, is evident, upon supposition, that God has requir'd and commanded, that his Church be one, which could not be, if a Secular Sovereign Power has Authority to break its Unity, upon pretence of judging any one of it's Doctrins or Practices false or Idolatrous: For if one may, another may, and then *Swisserland* may have as many Religions and Communions, as Cantons, and the World as many Churches as Secular Sovereigns, tho' God has said he will have but One: And here in *England* the Bishops may as well wave the Arch-bishops Authority, private persons pretend to Judge and Censure the Bishops Power and Authority, or any one Man controul the Authority of his Pastor. Tho' this we deny'd at first, and might therefore

fore well refuſe to proceed, till the Doctors had prov'd, that a ſingle Perſon might condemn a whole Church's Doctrin legally, or a leſſer Authority, judge and cenſure a greater; yet becauſe perhaps this Method may have been propos'd by your ſelves, we are content to do any thing for your ſatisfaction: but then you muſt be pleas'd (conſidering our Communion at the time of the Separation was infinitly greater than the Reformers, as Learned and as Holy, for ought any body knows, and in poſſeſſion for many hundred years of the Doctrins and Practices now condemn'd by theſe Reformers) to demand *more clear* and *evident proofs* againſt our Doctrins than we bring for them: for upon but equal proof, we that are forty to one (and every whit as learned as the others, eſpecially having receiv'd, what we profeſs, from our Forefathers, from Chriſts time, for ought any body knows; for no body can ſay when what we hold and practiſe begun) have no reaſon to ſubmit to ſo much a leſs number, at the charge of ſo great a confuſion, as muſt needs happen, and God's Command of Unity be broke into the bargain. You muſt therefore demand the moſt evident proofs that Nature can admit of, to prove thoſe Doctrins of theirs, upon which they ground their Separation, or elſe it will be *criminal* Schiſm, and you muſt deſert their Communion. If they attempt to prove it from Scripture, they muſt not bring obſcure paſſages out of it, to oppoſe or interpret clear ones; for that is not to explicate, but to confound; not to draw Light and Truth out of Scripture, but to caſt more Darkneſs upon it. Neither can an obſcure and doubtful Title lawfully or reaſonably caſt any Body out of the poſſeſſion of a belief, for which he has clear and evident ones to ſhew. They muſt therefore bring Texts that prove their Points in Terms; for their interpretation is no more to be allow'd of than ours, and Scripture ought to be taken literally,

where the literal ſenſe does not imply a contradiction.

Note. It may be reaſonably ſuppos'd, that theſe undeniable Principles were the cauſe, why the Doctors (as it will appear in all this Conference) would never venture upon any citation of the Scripture to prove their Doctrin, for which they ſeparated from the Roman Church, acknowledged then univerſally for the true Church, but were forc'd to fly to ſome obſcure Sentences of the Fathers, even which will yet appear to make more for the Roman Church, than for the Reformers.

Drs. All Scriptures ought not to be expounded literally, which do not imply a Contradiction in a literal ſenſe: *I am a Vine*, ought not to be expounded literally, yet it implies no Contradiction, or at leaſt no more than this, *Chriſt is Bread.*

Cath. I am a Vine does imply a Contradiction, for Chriſt cannot be *Chriſt* and a *Vine* at the ſame time; *Chriſt is Bread*, is alſo a Contradiction; but where is that Propoſition in Scripture? or what Catholic in the World holds it? We ſay, *that which was Bread ceaſes to be Bread, and becomes the Body of Chriſt*, which is no more a Contradiction than to ſay, that which was Water, ceaſes to be Water, and becomes Wine.

Drs. That Text you build your Faith upon, *This is my Body*, implies a Contradiction; for it muſt ſignifie, *This Bread is my Body*, which is as much a Contradiction, as *Chriſt is a Vine*, or *Chriſt is Bread*, which you have acknowledg'd already for a Contradiction; or elſe it muſt be an identical enuntiation, and ſignifie, *This my Body is my Body.*

Cath. *This Bread is my Body*, is a Contradiction, but cannot be meant in the Text; for in all Languages (but Engliſh) where the *word* which ſignifies *this* is alter'd accord-

according to the different Gender the Antecedent is of, to which this word ſhould relate, it is always put in the Neuter Gender, *hoc* in Latin, and τοῦτο in Greek, which it could not be, if it were to agree with *Bread*, or have relation to it, that being always Maſculin, as *panis* in Latin, and ἄρτος in Greek; therefore to ſay, *this Bread* in the Latin or Greek Language, would be falſe Grammer; and Engliſh, I ſuppoſe, has no reaſon to govern the other Languages, but they it, they being more and old, againſt one and new. Nor need it be; *This Body is my Body*; the Particle *this* is a Pronoun demonſtrative, ſignifying only ſome exterior Object undetermin'd, as to its Nature or Name, without ſome other additional Word, as *this is a Horſe, this is a Hat*, are, I hope, proper Speeches, and therefore no Identical Enuntiations. *This* only ſuppoſes an Object exiſting and expos'd to Senſe, and determin'd by the following word *Hat* or *Horſe*, of what Nature and Quality it is. Beſides, *This is my Body*, is an Efficient Propoſition, and is the cauſe of the change, which is not wrought till the Propoſition be compleated, and therefore *this* is not determin'd till the whole be pronounc'd.

Drs. It is impoſſible it ſhould be taken in your ſenſe, for Tranſubſtantiation cannot be without a Miracle; and no Miracle can be without appearing ſo to Senſe; Nay, it would deſtroy all poſſibility of judging of any other Miracle, they being not to be diſcern'd but by Senſe, which cannot be rely'd upon, if it may be deceiv'd in this.

Cath. A Miracle may be, and yet not appear to Senſe to be ſo, yet ought to be believ'd: For the hypoſtatical Union was never diſcern'd by Senſe, yet is believ'd a true Miracle; ſo that your firſt Propoſition is falſe. To your ſecond, I pray ſay, whether it be poſſible for God to make a thing appear to Senſe to be, what it is not: Then ſuppoſing it poſſible, may not God diſcover to Man that he

has

has made a thing to appear one thing, and to be another, as well as he has discover'd, that the Divinity was united to Christs Humanity, tho' no such thing appear'd? If he may and do's, ought I to believe Gods Word against my own Senses, or my Senses against Gods Word? Notwithstanding this, my Senses shall judge of a Miracle at all times, unless when God assures me upon his Word, that his Omnipotency has interpos'd between my Senses and their Natural Object.

Drs. But we will shew you by the *Fathers*, and not of the first 300 years, but since, that your Doctrin was not held, neither in the Greek nor Latin Church.

Cath. We do expect you should shew us by the Scripture and Fathers of all Ages, (and do not care to be complemented or spar'd as to the first 300 years, if you have any Authority from those times, let us see them) and very clearly, that your contrary Doctrin was held, else you cannot be justified or excused from Schism in your separation.

Dr. It is sufficient to shew against you, that your Doctrin has not had that constant Succession you boast of: And that I will do by producing Instances plain and clear, that your Doctrin was not maintain'd in one certain Age since Christ.

Cath. Tho' that can never justifie your separation, or make your Communion safe; for if it were not safe to stay in the Roman Communion, because a Doctrin believ'd by them, was in one Age since Christs time, not believ'd, it can never be safe to abide in yours, where many Doctrins are now believ'd, which you acknowledge were not believ'd by the true Church for many Hundred years together: Yet let us hear your proofs.

Dr. I will shew you a Homily us'd in the Saxon Church, from which you shall see how that Church and *your Auguſtin* agree in this Doctrin.

Cath.

Cath. At leaſt 'tis ſome kindneſs to grant *Auguſtin* to be *ours*, who Converted *England* above 1000 years ago.

Narr. Truly the Homily we did never ſee before, nor never heard of it, nor do we know what credit it bears, nor can I remember the words exactly; but in the firſt place the Doctor quoted, for he produc'd two, the ſenſe was, that the Bread and Wine which the Prieſt Conſecrated at Maſs, was turn'd into the True Body and Blood of Chriſt; which Text we pray'd the Doctor to read in Engliſh, which he did; and after a little ſtumble at the word *Miſſam*, he told us, he car'd not tho' he render'd it *Maſs*, which he did; This very Quotation we urg'd againſt him; but he told us this muſt be explain'd by another, in which he brought us the ſame, or like words again concerning the change, but at the end of the Sentence were theſe words in a diſtinct remarkable Character, *not Corporally but Spiritually.* Where, or by whom this Book was Printed, we could not learn, or what Authority it was of; but it might very well be Authentick, for all that diſtinction, it being frequently us'd by Modern Catholics, who are not deny'd to hold the Doctrin of Tranſubſtantiation; They commonly ſay, that it is not chang'd *Corporally*, taking *Corporally* to ſignifie *carnally*; as the Capharnaits underſtood our Bleſſed Lord, when he ſpoke of this Myſtery; but *Spiritually*, taking that to ſignifie, as St. *Paul* uſes the word *Spiritual*, ſpeaking of the Reſurrection, where he ſays, it is ſown *a natural Body*, it riſes a *Spiritual Body*. there is a natural Body, and there is a Spiritual Body; Now if this way of ſpeaking be frequently us'd by thoſe who are, notwithſtanding ſuch an expreſſion, confeſs'd to hold Tranſubſtantiation; why muſt it ſignifie more evidently the contrary Doctrin in this Author, than it do's in others, eſpecially when this Author delivers the Roman Doctrin in this point, in his other expreſſions, as

evidently

evidently and plainly as can be, and cites the *Maſs* as the Doctor confeſſes? But he ſtood not much upon this Queſtion, but laid his whole ſtreſs upon two others.

Dr. I will prove now evidently, that your Doctrin was contradicted in the fifth Age, both by the Greek and Latin Church; nay by a *Pope* of *Rome* himſelf: For *Gelaſius* diſputing againſt the *Eutychians*, who maintain'd, that the Human Nature of Chriſt was *chang'd* into the Divine Nature, ſo that there was but one nature in Chriſt; confuted their Hereſie, by ſhewing, that the Human Nature was no more chang'd into the Divine Nature, than *Bread* was *chang'd* into the *Body* of Chriſt; that is, not at all; for *Gelaſius* has theſe expreſs words: *Certe Sacramenta, quæ ſumimus, corporis & ſanguinis Chriſti, divina res eſt, propter quod & per eadem efficimur divinæ conſortes naturæ; & tamen eſſe non deſinit ſubſtantia vel natura panis & vini; & certe imago & ſimilitudo corporis & ſanguinis in actione myſteriorum celebrantur*; which is in Engliſh thus, *Truly the Sacraments of the Body and Blood of Chriſt which we take, is a Divine thing, and by them we are made partakers of the Divine Nature; and yet the Subſtance or Nature of Bread and Wine, do not ceaſe to be; and truly the Image and Similitude of the Body and Blood of Chriſt are celebrated in the action of the Myſteries*: Where it is evident, that the ſubſtance of Bread and Wine, is not chang'd into the Body and Blood of Chriſt. *Theodoret* proves the ſame thing; for he ſays, the Myſtical Signs after Conſecration do not recede from their Nature, but do remain in their former Subſtance, Figure and Form, and may be ſeen, and touch'd as before; this evidently contradicts Tranſubſtantiation.

Cath. To the Company.

We deſire you to remember, that you muſt have clear proofs to juſtifie the Alteration, much clearer than thoſe

in

in poſſeſſion can bring for the Doctrin they continue to hold, and which the others would Reform: Be pleas'd to conſider theſe two Quotations here brought (I ſuppoſe the cleareſt they have, if not all they have) and if they do not appear clear againſt them, I am confident they will appear, either Non-ſenſe or Contradictions, and far enough from being clearer for them, than any we can bring for our Doctrin; which yet they ought to be, to excuſe their Schiſm from being wilful and Criminal. We will examin *Theodoret* firſt. He writes againſt *Eutyches* (as the Doctor has told you) which he do's by way of Dialogue between *Eraniſtes* an *Eutychian*, and *Orthodoxus*, which is himſelf, in theſe words.

'*Eraniſt.* It happens luckily that you ſpeak of the Di- *Theod.* Tom. 2. Dial. 2. pag. 236. Edit. Colon. 1617.
'vine Myſteries, for even from that very thing I will
'ſhew you, that the Body of our Lord is chang'd into a-
'nother Nature; anſwer me therefore to what I ask.

'*Orthodox.* I will anſwer.

'*Eran.* What do you call that Gift which is brought,
'before the Invocation of the Prieſt?

'*Orth.* That which is made Nouriſhment of a certain
'Grain.

'*Eran.* How do we call the other Sign?

'*Orth.* A Common Name, which ſignifies a kind of
'Drink.

'*Eran.* But after Conſecration what do you call them?

'*Orth.* The Body of Chriſt, and the Blood of Chriſt.

'*Eran.* And do you believe that you are made Parta-
'ker of the Body and Blood of Chriſt?

'*Orth.* I do believe it.

'*Eran.* As therefore the Symbol of the Lord's Body
'and Blood are one thing before the Invocation of the
'Prieſt, and after the Invocation are chang'd and are
'made another thing: So the Body of our Lord after

'Assumption is chang'd into the Divine Substance.

'*Orth.* Thou art catch'd in the Net, which thou thy 'self hast woven: For the Mystical Signs after Conse-'cration do not recede from their Nature, but do re-'main in their former Substance and Figure and Form, 'and may be touch'd as before; but are understood to be 'what they are made, and are believ'd, and are Ador'd 'as being the same things which they are believ'd.

Cath. I pray be pleas'd to ask the Doctor whether this whole Discourse now cited be not built and founded upon the Supposition of Transubstantiation.

Drs. I do acknowledge the Argument is founded upon that Supposition; but it is brought by an Heretic, an *Eutychian*, which is not much for the credit of your Doctrin.

Cath. Yes, we account it much for the credit of our Doctrin, that you cannot name any Age, in which you are not forc'd to allow, that it was Profess'd. You say it was Profess'd in this Age only by Heretics: Make that out, if you can, more clear than I will the contrary; I do assure you, your two Quotations will not do it, as I will shew you presently; but the contrary seems evident, *viz.* That the Heretics did not differ from the Catholics in this Point: For *Eutyches*, who was Condemn'd at a General Council, for maintaining one Nature only in Christ, would certainly have been Condemn'd at the same time for holding Transubstantiation, had it been esteem'd an Error by that Age, especially so Absurd, Monstrous, and Idolatrous an one, as Doctor —— calls it in his new Book; but he was not Condemn'd, nor so much as Accus'd of Error in this Point, either by Council, or any particular Writer of those many, which have wrote against him, and yet you do acknowledge, that he and his Adherents held Transubstantiation: Besides, you confess that his Argument was against an

Ortho-

Orthodox Catholic, founded upon this Suppoſition; therefore moſt certainly he took it for granted, that the Catholics allow'd the Suppoſition; for it would have been ridiculous to diſpute upon a Suppoſition, which he knew his Adverſary deny'd. I ſhould account it abſurd for me to argue againſt a Proteſtant upon ſuppoſition of Tranſubſtantiation, which I know they deny; and ſo it would have been in *Eranist*, if he had not known that his Adverſary own'd that Doctrin, which he made the Foundation of his Argument. Beſides, *Theodoret* himſelf, an Orthodox Catholic, making this Diſcourſe by way of Dialogue, would make himſelf ridiculous to frame it upon a Suppoſition which he deny'd. After all this, the place now cited, is ſo far from being ſo clear againſt us, as it ought to be to vanquiſh our ſtanding Poſſeſſion, that the Century-Writers of *Magdeburg*, who were great Enemies of Popery and Tranſubſtantiation, do condemn *Theodoret* of *that Doctrin* from this very place, and do ſay he ſpeaks dangerouſly of the Lords Supper, in ſaying, *that after Conſecration the Symbols of our Lords Body and Blood are changed and made another thing.* And the words next after theſe, which you quote as ſuch clear ones againſt our Doctrin, muſt either import Idolatry according to the aforeſaid new Book, or Nonſenſe, if they do not imply the Actual Preſence of Chriſts Perſon by Tranſubſtantiation; for he ſays, *they* (the Myſtical Signs) *are underſtood what they are made and believ'd, and are Ador'd as being the ſame things they are believ'd*: So that the whole Senſe is thus; The Symbols of our Lord's Body and Bloud are one thing before, and another after Conſecration; yet they continue ſo in their Nature, Subſtance, Figure, and Form, as to be ſeen and touch'd as before; but are underſtood to be what they are made by Conſecration, and are Believ'd, and are Ador'd as being the ſame thing they are believ'd, *i. e.* notwithſtanding

Magd Cent. 5. cap. 4. *de Inclinatione Doct. tit. de Cœna Domini.*

ſtanding they are chang'd, they appear to our Senſe (as to their Nature, Subſtance, *&c.*) to be ſeen and touch'd as before: but are believ'd to be ſomewhat elſe, *i. e.* what they are made: And this Belief is not Chimerical or Imaginary, but the things are really what they are believ'd to be, and for that they are ſo, are Ador'd; ſo that they muſt be really chang'd into Chriſt's Body, for elſe they could not be Ador'd without Idolatry: The very Words, as they lay, convinc'd the *Magdeburgenſes*, that *Theodoret* held *Tranſubſtantiation*; and, I ſuppoſe, had not theſe two Words *Nature* and *Subſtance* been in the Quotation but only *Figure* and *Form*, we had never heard of it at this time. If therefore I ſhew you, that *Nature* and *Subſtance* are frequently taken to ſignifie that which is as conſiſtent with our Expoſition, and the Catholic meaning of *Theodoret*, as *Figure* and *Form* in this place are, I ſhall not only make it ceaſe to be clear againſt us, but alſo ſhew that it will be clear for us. *Nature* and *Subſtance* do ſometimes ſignifie what the Philoſophers call properly *Subſtance*, as diſtinguſh'd from Accidents, *i. e.* Matter and Form. And thus taken it can be no Object of Senſe, can neither be ſeen nor touch'd. Sometimes it ſignifies the Properties, natural Qualities, and Accidents with which thoſe Subſtances are cloathed. Phyſicians frequently ſay, that they have the Subſtance of Herbs in their Medicins, when they have only the Vertue of thoſe Herbs, and not all the Matter and Form: So we ſay of Meat, that it has but little Juice or *Subſtance*, when it has but little Vertue or good natural Qualities. The Fathers ſay, that the *Subſtance* of Man was deprav'd by Original Sin, *i. e.* the Inclinations and natural Affections: St. *Paul* ſays, that by *Nature* we are the Children of Wrath, that the Gentiles by *Nature* perform the Law: In all which Speeches, and a hundred other, *Nature* and *Subſtance* do not ſignifie ſtrictly, as Philoſophers uſe

thoſe Words, when they are oppos'd to *Accidents*, but Popularly and Vulgarly, and ſignifie no more than Properties, Conditions, Qualities, *&c.* Now ſuppoſing *Theodoret* to take *Subſtance* and *Nature* in this place, in the latter Senſe, and to mean by them no more than the *exterior Subſtance*, or viſible and ſenſible *Qualities* of Bread and Wine, the Text is evidently for us. And that the Father muſt take the Words in this popular Senſe, is evident from the whole Diſcourſe: For he ſays firſt, That before Conſecration they are *one thing*, and after Conſecration they are chang'd and made *another thing*: Now if they be chang'd and made another *thing*, the change muſt be either in the Interior or Exterior Subſtance; but it is moſt plain, they are not chang'd in the Exterior Subſtance, for as to that, they remain viſibly the ſame, and do not recede from their Nature, as Senſe aſſures us; *Ergo*, it muſt be in their Interior Subſtance, which is not liable to Senſe; and therefore, as the Father in this very place ſays, *They are ſeen and touch'd as before, but are believ'd to be another thing*, i. e. *what they are made, and are ador'd as being what they are believ'd.* The Doctor has told you in the late Book I mentioned, the danger of adoring any thing but God; therefore, according to him, this Father muſt hold theſe Symbols he here ſpeaks of, to be chang'd into the Body of our Lord, before they become the Object of Adoration, or elſe he muſt be guilty of Idolatry, in teaching that ſomething beſides God ought to be Ador'd, *i. e.* Worſhip'd with Divine Honor. As to the place quoted out of *Gelaſius*, the ſame diſtinction above of the ſenſe of the Words, *Nature* and *Subſtance*, ſolves that; And that there muſt be ſuch a diſtinction in the Words of this Father, is moſt evident; for without that, he contradicts himſelf in the Words quoted; for he has two Words five times in ten lines; and if in all theſe Places they muſt ſignifie ſtrictly, the Father talks Non-

ſenſe,

ſenſe, and ſo, far enough from being a good Authority to juſtifie a Separation. But if the Words muſt be taken in divers Senſes, and it not being evident which Senſe is applicable to this or that place, then it is at leaſt uncertain and dark, and conſequently not fit (as not being ſo clear as it ſhould) to juſtifie a Separation. But if the Place it ſelf, from its own terms, diſpoſes us to apply the ſtrict Senſe in this or that Part, and the popular Senſe in this or that other, ſo as to countenance Tranſubſtantiation, then this Quotation will be very far from doing them any Service. Now let us conſider the Words: He ſays, *By the Sacrament we are made Partakers of the Divine Nature, yet the Subſtance or Nature of Bread and Wine do not ceaſe to be.* If *Nature* muſt be taken ſtrictly and philoſophically in both places, then we are made Partakers of the Divine Nature ſtrictly and philoſophically, and not only effectually or virtually: then the Divine Nature muſt be actually there, and yet the Nature of Bread and Wine will not ceaſe to be there; ſo that this perhaps thus far might favour Lutheraniſm, but can no way help the Church of *England*: Then follow theſe words, *And ſurely the Image and Similitude of the Body and Blood of Chriſt are celebrated in the Action of thoſe Myſteries.* We do own this Expreſſion, and do acknowledge it is frequent amongſt the Fathers to ſay, that the bleſſed Sacrament is a Figure of Chriſt's Paſſion, and that the Exterior Subſtances, which we ſee, are a Figure to us of the Interior Subſtance of Chriſt's Body and Blood, which we ſee not, but are to believe to be contain'd under thoſe Species: Then he goes on and ſays, *Therefore it appears evidently enough to us, that that is to be underſtood by us in our Lord Chriſt himſelf, which we profeſs in the Image of him.* Obſerve, that *Image* is here us'd, as we ſaid above, *We celebrate and take them, and even as they paſs into this, to wit, the Divine Subſtance, by the Power of the Holy Spirit, remaining*

maining notwithſtanding in the Property of their Nature, &c. We ſpoke to the ſignification of the Word *Nature* above, ſpeaking to the foregoing Words of this Father. Now let us conſider the Word *Subſtance*, which the Proteſtants muſt have to ſignifie ſtrictly and philoſophically in the Words before, or elſe this Quotation proves nothing: But that being ſuppos'd, they muſt ſhew us, that it ſignifies otherways in theſe laſt Words, *They paſs into the Divine Subſtance*, or elſe they muſt grant, that it ſignifies ſtrictly here alſo; and then it is Nonſenſe, for it amounts to thus much, The Elements of Bread and Wine paſs into *the Divine Subſtance* ſtrictly and philoſophically, and we are made partakers of the Divine Nature ſtrictly, *&c.* Yet *the Subſtance and Nature of Bread and Wine do not ceaſe to be ſtrictly and philoſophically.* Can any Body underſtand this? What does paſs into the Divine Subſtance? Nothing ſure, if the Nature and Subſtance of Bread and Wine taken ſtrictly and philoſophically do remain: But the Internal Subſtance of Bread and Wine may well paſs into the Divine Subſtance, and yet the Exterior Nature and Subſtance of Bread and Wine, ſignifying the Properties and Accidents of Bread and Wine, may well remain. And that this muſt be the Senſe of the Father, is plain enough from his own words; for he ſays abſolutely, and without any limitation, *That they paſs into the Divine Subſtance*, which muſt be meant of the Interior Subſtance of Bread and Wine, if any; for 'tis clear, the Exterior remains, and does not paſs. But then again, he qualifies too the Nature, which he ſays remains, and calls it the *Property of their Nature remaining*: Which Expreſſion does, as we think, clear the diſtinction, and determins to which ſide the *ſtrict*, and to which the *popular* Senſe ought to be apply'd. At leaſt, we are ſure there can be no clear Evidence from hence againſt us, which yet we muſt have before we can be remov'd

from

from the long poſſeſſion, which we have had of a Doctrin and Practice of ſuch concern as this.

Drs. The Expoſition now given, cannot be poſſibly the Fathers meaning, for that that Senſe would quite enervate the force of the Anſwer; for the Anſwer muſt be proper to the Argument, which it is intended to Anſwer, and to the Point which the Argument was made uſe of to prove: Now the Point to be prov'd was the Doctrin of the *Eutychians*, viz. *That the Human Nature of Chriſt was chang'd into the Divine*; to prove which, the *Eutychians* urg'd the change in the *Sacrament*, and from thence urg'd to the change of the *Natures*; to which the Father anſwer'd, that there was *no change* in the Sacrament, nor *no more* change in the Natures, than there was in the other: This muſt needs be the meaning of the Father.

Cath. The Expoſition above given by us makes the Fathers words very much more a proper Anſwer to the *Eutychians* Argument, than they could be otherways; for whereas he aſſerted an abſolute and total Converſion of the Human Nature in Chriſt, into the Divine, ſo that it was wholly devour'd and ſwallow'd up by it, like a drop of Hony by the Sea; and endeavor'd to illuſtrate it from the *change* of the *Bread* and *Wine* in the Sacrament into the *Body* and *Blood* of *Chriſt*, as a Point acknowledg'd by both Parties; to this the Father anſwer'd, that the very Inſtance he gave was againſt himſelf; for that after the change in the Sacrament, there were ſtill *two Natures* remaining, *viz.* the *Nature* of *Chriſts Body* in the ſtrict Senſe, and the *Nature of Bread* as above Explicated, for the *Natural Properties*, in the popular Senſe. And this being ſufficient to retort the *Eutychian*'s Argument upon himſelf, by ſhewing him there was not *ſuch a change* in the *Sacrament*, as he vainly imagin'd in the *Incarnation*, it was all that was neceſſary

Ibid. Dial. 2. pag. 234.

ceſſary for the Father's deſign in that place. For as for the Interior change, himſelf acknowledged it, as well as the *Eutychian*. Are theſe all the Authorities you have?

Dr. Theſe are enough, for they are very plain.

Cath. We will leave that to judgment: But withal, we hope the Company will remember, they muſt be much plainer than any we can bring for our ſelves: We therefore deſire now to ſhew ſome for us. And becauſe we will ſhew how truly the Doctor has aſſerted, That in an Age ſince the firſt 300 years, this Doctrin was generally contradicted, and the contrary Doctrin, *viz.* that of the Church of *England*, generally profeſs'd and taught (for that he muſt be ſuppos'd to have deſign'd to prove, or elſe he do's nothing in Juſtification of his Separation) and has pitch'd upon the fifth Century to make good his Aſſertion, we will inſiſt particularly upon the Authority of Fathers of that very Century: And firſt, we deſire him to conſider, St. *Auſtin*, Tom. 8. in *Pſal.* 98. Printed at *Venice*, *An.* 1584. Where he ſays, *Exaltate Dominum Deum noſtrum, & adorate Scabellum pedum ejus, quoniam ſanctum eſt: Quid habemus adorare? Scabellum pedum ejus; ſed videte Fratres, quid nos jubeat adorare. Alio loco Scriptura dicit, cœlum mihi ſedes eſt, terra autem ſcabellum pedum meorum. Ergo terram nos jubet adorare, quia alio loco dixit, quod ſit ſcabellum Dei, & quomodo adorabimus terram, cum dicat aperte Scriptura, Dominum Deum tuum adorabis, & hic dicit, Adorate ſcabellum pedum ejus? Exponens autem mihi quid ſit ſcabellum pedum ejus, dicit, Terra autem ſcabellum pedum meorum: Anceps factus ſum, timeo adorare terram, ne damnet me, qui fecit cœlum & terram: Rurſum timeo non adorare ſcabellum pedum Domini mei, quia Pſalmus mihi dicit, Adorate ſcabellum pedum ejus. Quæro quid ſit ſcabellum pedum ejus, & dicit mihi Scriptura, Terra ſcabellum*

pedum meorum. Fluctuans converto me ad Chriſtum, quia ipſum quæro hic, & invenio quomodo ſine impietate adoretur terra, ſine impietate adoretur ſcabellum pedum ejus: Suſcepit enim de terra terram, quia caro de terra eſt, & de carne Mariæ *carnem accepit; & quia in ipſa carne hic ambulavit, & ipſam carnem nobis manducandam ad ſalutem dedit; nemo autem illam carnem manducat, niſi prius adoraverit; inventum eſt quomodo adoretur tale ſcabellum pedum Domini & non ſolum non peccemus adorando, ſed peccemus non adorando.* We deſire the Doctor will be pleas'd to put this place of the Father into Engliſh, that the Company may judge of the Senſe of it, eſpecially at the latter end, which is chiefly to our purpoſe.

Dr. I will, it is thus. *Wavering I turn my ſelf to Chriſt, becauſe I ſeek him here, and I find how the Earth may be Ador'd without impiety; without impiety his Foot-ſtool may be Ador'd; For of Earth he took Earth, becauſe Fleſh is of Earth, and he took Fleſh of the Fleſh of the Virgin* Mary; *and becauſe he walked here in that Fleſh, and gave that Fleſh to us to Eat for our Salvation; but no Man Eats that Fleſh, unleſs he firſt Adores; we have found out how ſuch a Foot-ſtool of our Lord may be Ador'd, and not only not ſin by Adoring, but we ſin by not Adoring,* This is the Engliſh of the words quoted, which makes nothing againſt us, for we in the Church of *England*, do always Adore when we do receive.

Cath. What do you Adore when you receive? Do you Adore that which you do receive? If you do, then that which you receive is the Fleſh of Chriſt, or you are Idolaters, as lately great pains has been taken to prove. If you do not Adore that which you receive, as the Object of your Adoration, but ſomething elſe, then you will find that St. *Auſtin* is againſt you, for that he Ador'd the *Footſtool*, that is, *the Fleſh i. e.* that

that Fleſh which is eaten; for it were impoſſible to think, that the Father could be in that *doubt* and *trouble* which he expreſſes, about the Queſtion, *whether Chriſt were to be Ador'd or no?* He is concern'd about the Footſtool, which he endeavors to make ſo plain, that he repeats the ſame thing over and over again, and tells his fear of Adoring or not Adoring: At length he ſays, By *Footſtool*, (becauſe Earth is the Footſtool) is meant *Chriſts Fleſh*, in which *Fleſh* he walk'd here, which very *Fleſh* he gave to us to Eat, which very Fleſh no Man Eats, but he firſt Adores, what? The Fleſh of Chriſt ſure: And if *that Fleſh* he gave to Eat, be the ſame *Fleſh* he took from our Bleſſed Lady, and in which he walk'd, as the Father ſays here moſt abſolutely, then ſurely *Fleſh to be* Eaten, is as much the Object of Adoration, as *that* he took and walked in, which I hope the Doctor will not deny, but was to be Ador'd. So that now, ſays the Father (having juſt before ſpoken of the Fleſh which Chriſt gave us to Eat, and which no Man Eats without firſt Adoring) *I have found out how ſuch a Footſtool ought to be Ador'd, and that we do not only not ſin by Adoring, but we ſin by not Adoring ſuch a Footſtool*, to wit, *Fleſh*, which was given us to Eat. Beſides the Adoration the Doctor ſpeaks of, may be given at any time, and before any thing, as well as *Bread* and *Wine* in the Sacrament; for if it be only the perſon of Chriſt ſitting in Heaven, which ought to be Ador'd, and is Ador'd when we are put in mind of him by ſuch Inſtruments; we might as well fall down and Adore the Perſon of Chriſt in Heaven, when we ſee an *Image* of him, becauſe that puts us in mind of him (which yet the above named Doctor ſays is Idolatry) or take a piece of *common Bread* at ones Houſe, remembring

by it what *Christ* once did with Bread, fall down and Adore before that Bread.

Nar. St. *Ambrose*, who was somewhat Elder than St. *Austin*, and his Master, has the Plainest Quotations to prove this Point that can possibly be, in his Book, *De iis qui Mysteriis initiantur. Cap.* 9. in his fourth Book, *de Sacramentis*, *Cap.* 4. *&* *Cap.* 5. which Books we desir'd; but the Doctor being in his own House (tho' he confess'd he had the Books) he might chuse whether he would let us have them or no. And indeed for one reason or other we had them not, nor St. *Chrysostom* of the same Age, out of whom we would have shewn only his 83*d*. *Homily*, upon the 26*th*. of St. *Matthew*, and his *Sermon* of the *Eucharist in Encæniis*, to prove our Doctrin; we would have shewn very many places from that Father; but having not these Books, nor others we ask'd for, we were forc'd to quote some places without Book, as one out of St. *Gregory Nyss. Orat. Catechet.* Cap. 37. *Verbo Dei Sanctificatum panem in Dei Verbi Corpus credo transmutari*, &c. *hoc autem fit virtute Benedictionis in illud transelementatâ eorum quæ apparent naturâ. I do believe the Bread Sanctified by the Word of God to be chang'd into the Body of God the Word*, &c. *but this is done by the Power of Consecration (or blessing) the nature of those things which appear being Transelementated into it.* St. *Cyril* of *Jerusalem* we had, out of whom we desir'd the Doctor to read these following words in English. *Cum igitur Christus ipse sic affirmet atque dicat de pane*, HOC EST CORPUS MEUM; *Quis deinceps audeat dubitare? Ac eodem quoque confirmante ac dicente*, HIC EST SANGUIS MEUS, *quis inquam, dubitet & dicat non esse illius sanguinem? Aquam aliquando mutavit in Vinum, quod est Sanguini propinquum in Cana Galileæ sola voluntate, & non erit dignus*

dignus cui credamus, quod Vinum in Sanguinem transmutasset? Si enim ad nuptias Corporeas invitatus stupendum miraculum operatus est, & non multo magis Corpus & Sanguinem suum Filiis sponsæ dedisse illum confitebimur? Quare, cum omni certitudine Corpus & Sanguinem Christi sumamus: Nam sub specie Panis datur tibi Corpus, & sub specie Vini datur Sanguis, ut sumpto Corpore & Sanguine Christi efficiaris ei comparticeps Corporis & Sanguinis, χϱιστοφοροι, *Christopheri erimus, hoc est, Christum ferentes, cum ejus Corpus & Sanguinem in membra nostra receperimus, atque ita, ut beatus Petrus dicit, Divinæ Naturæ consortes efficiemur,* &c. *Hoc sciens, & pro certissimo habens Panem hunc, qui videtur à nobis non esse Panem, etiamsi gustus Panem esse sentiat, sed esse Corpus Christi, & Vinum quod à nobis conspicitur tametsi sensui gustus Vinum esse videatur, non tamen Vinum, sed Sanguinem esse Christi.* Sir, if you please, I will spare you the trouble, and render them my self; and pray tell the Company when I wrong the Text: The English then of these words, is thus:

When therefore Christ himself affirms and says of Bread, THIS IS MY BODY; *Who afterwards will dare to doubt? And the same also confirming and saying,* THIS IS MY BLOOD; *Who, I say, may doubt and say, That it is not his Blood? He once chang'd Water into Wine, which is next to Blood, in* Cana *of* Galilee, *by his only Will; and shall he not be worthy that we believe him that he chang'd Wine into his Blood? For if being invited to a corporal Wedding, he wrought so wonderful a Miracle, shall we not much more confess, that he gave his Body and Blood to the Sons of his own Spouse? Wherefore let us take the Body and Blood of Christ with all assurance; for under the Species (or Appearance) of Bread, the Body is given thee, and under the Species of Wine, the Blood is given: so that the Body*

and

and Blood of Christ being taken, thou art made to him a Fellow-partaker of his Body and Blood. We are made Christophori, i. e. *Bearers of Christ, when we take his Body and Blood into our Members. So as blessed St.* Peter *says, We are made Partakers of the Divine Nature,* &c. *Knowing this, and holding it for most certain, that the Bread which we see is not Bread, though our Taste judges it to be Bread, but the Body of Christ: And the Wine which we see, though it may appear Wine to our Sense of Tasting; yet is not Wine, but the Blood of Christ.* Doctor, Is this plain English, and is the Father faithfully Translated?

Drs. We do not deny, but the Fathers now cited, have the Words quoted in their Writings; nor do we deny but that they are well enough English'd: but we do confess all they say; for we of the Church of *England* do own and acknowledge a very great Change and Alteration in the Sacrament, and do not deny, but that the Fathers do frequently make mention of some wonderful Change; but we do not undertake to determin Magisterially, and say what manner of Change this is, nor does our Church impose such a Determination, as a necessary Condition of Communion with us, as the Church of *Rome* does; and such a one as the Fathers contradict, as we have shewn out of *Theodoret* and *Gelasius*. And this very Father quoted here, *viz.* St. *Cyril*, calls it *Bread* and *Wine*, at the same time that he calls it the *Body* and *Blood of Christ*: For the first Words of his Quotation are, *When Christ affirms of Bread,* &c. You must shew that the *Substance* of Bread ceases.

Cath. The Evidence you pretend to from *Theodoret* and *Gelasius*, we think we have spoke to sufficiently already. If the Fathers do mention some wonderful Change in the Sacrament, and the Protestants do

agree

agree with them in allowing that there is ſuch a Change, but cannot ſay what a one it is, what cauſe have they to ſeparate from a great Communion, even the whole viſible Catholic Church upon Earth; when, for ought they know, this *Change* which they grant, may be *Tranſubſtantiation*, which they deny, and make the Cauſe of their Separation, as being falſe? For they acknowledge they *know not how* it is chang'd, and in ſuch Caſes as this, I cannot imagine how they can attain a Negative Knowledge without a Poſitive, *i.e.* how they can be certain it is not *Tranſubſtantiation*, when the whole Catholic Church ſaid it was; and not to be able to know Certainly what it is; eſpecially when to believe right of this Point, is an Article of Faith, conditional of Man's Salvation; and therefore neceſſary to be believed in its true Senſe; eſpecially when the Conſequence of believing wrong will be *Blaſphemy* or *Idolatry* in the Practice. For if *Tranſelementation* in St. *Gregory*, and *Tranſmutation* in St. *Cyril*, both which terms the Doctor owns and allows, ſhould mean as much as *Tranſubſtantiation*; then are the Proteſtants guilty of Hereſie, in believing the wrong ſide of a Propoſition, which contains in it an Article of Faith; and of *Blaſphemy in practice*, in robbing God of his Honor, and uſing him like a Creature. Now what ſhould make them think (for know, I am ſure they cannot) that *Tranſelementation* ſignifies leſs than *Tranſubſtantiation*? For ſure by *Elements* are meant *Subſtances*. Moreover, in all Changes, there muſt a Term from which, and a Term to which. In this Change I deſire to know the Term from which, and to what it is chang'd: From *Bread* to *Chriſt's Body*, were an Anſwer intelligible, and agreeable to the Terms by which the Change is expreſs'd: But to ſay from Common Bread to San-

ctified

ctified Bread, is to talk very unintelligibly, and very unanſwerably to the expreſſion you uſe to this Change; for this would not be at all *wonderful*. We ſee Churches and Church-yards thus chang'd every day, from *Common* to *Conſecrated* or *Sanctified* Places, and yet we think it no Wonder, or account it no Miracle; yet we ſhould wonder to hear one ſay, after conſecrating a Church or a Churchyard, it were Tranſelementated or chang'd wonderfully *by the Word of God*, as St. *Gregory* ſays; or *By the power of the holy Spirit*, as *Gelaſius* has it; or *By the Omnipotency of God*, as St. *Cyprian* ſays, and many other Fathers in ſuch like Expreſſions. You ſay, you do *not determin* the Change, *&c.* the more to blame you. For if it be neceſſary to Salvation, to believe right in this Point, *i. e.* to believe that the Object preſent to you after Conſecration, is the Body of Chriſt, if it be ſo; and to believe it it is not, if it be not ſo; then ought you at leaſt to determin whether it be ſo or no, and make a firm Aſſent to that your Determination a neceſſary Condition of Communion with you (a firm and actual Belief of one of theſe two Propoſitions, *It is really the Body of Chriſt*, or *it is not*, being a neceſſary Condition of Mans Salvation.) For ſure you will hold, that that which is a neceſſary Condition of Salvation, ought to be made a neceſſary Condition of Communion; therefore if you do not determin at leaſt ſo far, as to ſay, *It is*, or *it is not the Body of Chriſt*, and require that this your Determination be believ'd as a Condition of Communion with you, you do by the firſt, *i. e.* not *determining*, leave all People in your Communion in a very great uncertainty, as to the Condition of their Salvation: For how can private perſons have any kind of certainty in a diſputed Point, without ſome judicial Determination of that diſpute?

After

After which indeed, they may have Certainty, or Probability answerable to the Authority of the Determination, which will be infallible, if the Authority be infallible; or only a Probability; and that greater or less, according to the Degrees of Credit, which the Authority may challenge, if that Authority be but able to give a probable Determination. By the second, *viz.* not requiring the belief of your Determination, as a Condition of Communion, in case you do determin, you do confess that *Heretics* and *Blasphemers*, or *Heretics* and *Idolaters*, may be of your Communion, tho' professedly such, *i. e.* you do allow your Communion to them who observe not the Condition of their Salvation. For if determining it *not to be the Body of Christ*, you do not make the belief of this Determination, a Condition of Communion, you do allow those that believe contradictorily, (*i. e.* that *it is the Body Christ*, and in consequence of that belief make it the formal Object of Adoration,) to be of your Communion; and yet if your Determination be true, these last, who believe and adore, as aforesaid, are *Idolaters*, and do break thereby the Condition of their Salvation. Now I leave to the judgment of the Company, whether this undetermined Doctrin of yours be a lawful cause for you to separate from the Church you were once Members of, and was acknowledg'd the true Church, to believe you know not what your selves; for I am sure you cannot determin what change it is.

As to the Term *Bread* used by the Father, it can create no difficulty; for when we said, as we did at first, that all Scripture was to be expounded Literally, if the literal Sense did not imply a Contradiction; we did suppose that in case it did imply a Contradiction, it ought to be expounded otherwise. Instance was given in this, *I am a Vine*: What we suppos'd of the Scripture, must

hold of all Speeches, if the literal Senſe implies a Contradiction, they muſt be expounded otherwiſe. Now mark the Father, he ſays, Chriſt affirming of Bread, *this is my Body, &c.* This Bread is my Body is a Contradiction, therefore Bread or Body muſt not be taken Literally. At the latter end of this Quotation, the Father ſays, the *Bread* which we ſee is *not Bread*, but the Body of Chriſt; there cannot be a plainer Contradiction than *is*, and *is not*; therefore *Bread* the Subject in this Propoſition, of which ſo palpable a Contradiction is predicated, muſt needs be under ſome other Signification beſides it's Literal one, becauſe this Predicate ſo peremptorily Negative, *is not Bread*, and ſo determin'd poſitively, *but Chriſts Body*, are ſo evident and plain, that they are not capable of being miſconſtrued, eſpecially being Predicates, which always limit and determin the Subject. So that *Bread* is ſo call'd, becauſe it once was Bread (as *Moſes* his Rod, tho' chang'd into a Serpent, was notwithſtanding call'd a Rod, becauſe it had been ſo) and ſtill appears to the Senſes to be Bread, as the Father here tells us, with this Reduplication for fear of miſtake, *yet it is not Bread.* I cannot uſe plainer words to explicate the Father, than his own. He that can make Proteſtantiſm out of theſe Texts, may expound *Bellarmin* and the Council of *Trent*, when they pleaſe, and make them *Proteſtants* too.

As to your Demand, that we ſhould ſhew that the *Subſtance* of Bread ceaſes; I think you never need have it ſhewn plainer than in the words before you, which ſay, *that that which ſeems Bread is not Bread*; I ſuppoſe by *Subſtance* of Bread, you mean the *Being* of Bread; therefore the *Being* ceaſing, the *Subſtance* muſt ceaſe; but the *Being* ceaſes according to this Text; *for that which was Bread is not Bread*, therefore the Subſtance ceaſes, and there is a change, which you grant *wonderful*, and what

can

can this change be, but this Subſtance ceaſing to be is chang'd into another Subſtance, which we call Tranſubſtantiation? And yet

Becauſe St. *Cyprian* lies here before us, I will ſhew you a Quotation out of him, where he ſays, *that Bread is chang'd, not only in Effigie, or Similitude, but in Nature, being by the Omnipotent Power of God made Fleſh.* St. Cyp. *de Cœn. Domini.*

Dr. I wonder you ſhould quote that place out of St. *Cyprian*, which is notoriouſly known to be none of his, for the Manuſcript of that Work is now in *Oxford Library*, and bears the Name of another Author, ſome Hundred Years younger than St. *Cyprian*.

Cath. But do you acknowledge that the words quoted out of this Work (be it whoſe it will) do ſignifie Tranſubſtantiation?

Drs. We do not deny, but that many Authors of latter Ages have writ very odly of that Point, and we do think this, among the reſt, one of them.

Cath. This is the firſt time, that ever we heard of any ſuch Manuſcript of this work in *Oxford*; and yet I have met with many Proteſtants that have made it their buſineſs to prove it none of St. *Cyprians*; and 'tis much that none of them ſhould ever hear of this Manuſcript and urge it, if it were ſo evidently known to be another Man's, and whoſe, and of what Age. But this I am ſure, that *Cocus*, the famous Man for excepting againſt places brought by *Catholics* for their Doctrins, do's impugn this Book chiefly from *Bellarmin's* Confeſſions, who indeed do's ſay, *that it may ſeem to be none of St.* Cyprians; but adds immediately after, *that it was the work of ſome Learned Man of the ſame Age, as our Adverſaries acknowledge*, to which *Cocus* ſays nothing, and therefore may well be thought to allow it. Mr. *Fulk* againſt the *Rhemiſh* Teſtament, upon 1 *Cor. cap.* 7. *fol.* 282. ſays, *the Author de Cœna Domini*, which is the

Work now mentioned, *was not in time much Inferior to* Cyprian: And *Erasmus* (a great Man with the Protestants) in his Annotations annexed to St. *Cyprians* Works, Printed at *Basil*, 1558. *fol.* 287. affirmeth it to be the Work of some Learned Man of that Age; so that taking *Cocus* his silence to what *Bellarmin* says, and Mr. *Fulk* and *Erasmus* their plain affirmations of the Age of this Work, to be worth any thing; and taking this Doctors Confession, that the words in this Work are *odd*, as savoring of Transubstantiation, you have an Argument of *Transubstantiation* in St. *Cyprians* Age, or at least of a time not much inferior.

Gentlem. to the Doctor.

Sir, I have observ'd the Discourse as well as I could, and I find the great Point in Dispute, is, what the Fathers held a great while ago. As to the Doctrin in debate, you have brought places of both sides, which we must consider more at leisure; but at present will you be pleas'd to Answer me a Question or two, which occur to me to ask?

Dr. With all my Heart.

Gent. How long is it since Transubstantiation (the word I mean) has been Establish'd?

Dr. Ever since the *Lateran Council*, about 450 Years ago.

Gent. Did the Church understand the word *Transubstantiation*, then to signifie any new Doctrin, or only to express the very self same Doctrin which they believ'd before?

Dr. We do believe that the *word* was not taken to signifie any thing but what was believ'd before.

Gent. When did the Church begin to believe that Doctrin, which it seems it did believe at and before the *Lateran Council*, and thought then well express'd by the word *Transubstantiation*?

Dr.

Dr. We confeſs we cannot tell, for great Errors arrive often from little beginnings, and do grow up inſenſibly.

Gent. How long was it after the *Lateran Council* before this Doctrin was complain'd of?

Dr. About three hundred years.

Gent. How came we to diſcern this to be an Error three hundred years after, which our Forefathers held for a Truth three hundred years together in expreſs Terms, and no body knows how much longer they held the ſame thing in other Terms? Is it not much, an Error could be ſo general, and ſo long maintain'd without any Oppoſition or Notice taken of its Birth or Origin?

Dr. It was not ſo General, but that ſome oppos'd it, as the *Waldenſes*; but it is not ſtrange that an Error ſhould be general and long maintain'd; for the Church of *Rome* ſays, that the *Greek Church* err'd generally and long, in teaching that the *Holy Ghoſt* proceeds not from the Son.

Cath. But the Church of *Rome* never taught, that the *whole Catholic Church* err'd in teaching that Doctrin; for though that part which is now call'd the *Greek Church*, be condemn'd for that Error, yet we know how and when it began, and who oppos'd it; we know that very many of the *Greeks* never conſented to it, but did then, and have always ſince continued in Communion with the Church of *Rome*; ſo that that Error was ſo far from being general, that it was always oppos'd by the *Latin Church*, and great part of the *Greeks* too; whereas no Body oppos'd Tranſubſtantiation, but known Heretics, who began before the *Lateran Council* we ſpeak of, and were condemn'd by it; and were ſuch as the *Waldenſes*, (a People, as I ſuppoſe, you would be loath to own for your Predeceſſors.) And that all the World ſhould conſent ſo quietly all at one time to adore that for God, which the day before was univerſally believ'd to be but a piece of Bread, and was us'd accordingly; and no Man living

living in the World take notice when this was done, nor upon what occasion, or give it the least Opposition, is a Miracle ten times greater (if there be any Degrees in Miracles) than this, which you cannot believe for its difficulty, *viz. Transubstantiation*; especially when we can shew in every Age, when any Opposition was made to this Doctrin, who they were that did it, and what became of them. *Berengarius* was above a hundred years before the *Lateran Council*; yet we can shew that he was oppos'd by Bishops and Fathers of almost all Countries, as by *Lanfranck* of *Canterbury*, *Durandus Troarnensis*, *Guitmundus*, four Bishops of *Rome*, and by the Pastors of all Countries, how he recanted three times, and how he died. *Joannes Scotus Erigena*, who lived about two hundred years before, and had laid some Grounds for *Berengarius* his Error, was treated as an *Innovator* by *Hincmarus* and others, himself forced to retire out of *France*, and *his Book* not heard of again till two hundred years after; and no Man living can tell us, when this absurd Doctrin (as the Doctor calls it) which has had such Success in the World, as to obtain Belief universally, for several hundred years, ever had any Beginning, or any considerable Opposition. For though the Word *Transubstantiation* was not commonly us'd before the Council of *Luteran*, it matters not, nor makes any new Belief, since it has always been the constant practice of the Church in the General Councils, when it did condemn Heretical Opinions, or decide any Point in debate, to expound the true Sense of Scripture, upon that very Point, by some very significant Word, to leave no occasion of Cavilling or Disputing upon its Decisions, declaring by an explicit Act and positive Definition, what was the true Sense of Scripture, and what implicitly all the whole Catholic Church did believe before, as it appears in several other Councils, as in that of *Nice* against the *Arians*, where the

Word

Word *Conſubſtantial* was found out to condemn their Hereſie, they pretending that the Son was ὁμοιούσιος, that is, of *like Subſtance* to the Father, when the Council defin'd him to be ὁμοούσιος, *i. e.* of the *ſame Subſtance* or *Conſubſtantial*. The ſame you may obſerve in the Council of *Chalcedon*, where *Neſtorius* was condemn'd by the new diſtinction of Θεοτόκος and Χριστοτόκος.

Gent. Suppoſing, Sir, that the Roman Doctrin in this Point be falſe, and their practice *Idolatry*, and yet both were Univerſal for ſeveral Ages together, which way can the *Church* of *England* pretend to good and lawful Ordination? for they pretend to none, but what they receiv'd from *Idolaters*, *i. e.* the Church of *Rome*.

Dr. Very well, for though they were *Idolaters*, they might give *good* and *lawful* Ordinations, for the very Church of *Rome* holds, that *mortal ſin* do's not hinder a Biſhop or Prieſt from executing his Function.

Cath. All Mortal Sins may not hinder a Biſhop from executing his Function, or giving good and lawful Ordination, yet ſome may: For if a Biſhop ſhould become a *Jew*, (and the ſame thing may be ſaid if he becomes an *Idolater*) you ſurely will not allow him to give good and lawful Chriſtian Ordination: For that which deſtroys the Eſſence of a Church or a Chriſtian, muſt needs diſable thoſe it falls upon, from giving *legal* Commiſſions at leaſt, to others to govern the Church, or to adminiſter the Sacraments of *Chriſt*.

Drs. There are *two ſorts* of *Idolatry*, one of the *Heathens*, and another (if you will have it) of the *Church of Rome*.

Cath. We will have any thing that you will make evident; but when you tell us of *two ſorts* of *Idolatries*, I hope you do not mean *Material* and *Formal* Idolatry, the firſt of which, if purely ſuch, is no Crime. We ſpeak all along of Formal *Idolatry*, which you muſt accuſe

cuse the Church of *Rome* of, or else you do nothing; and if you do, I pray shew how the nature of *formal Idolatry* becomes chang'd by its relation to *Heathens*, from what it is when it relates to a *Papist*. I doubt you mean by your *two sorts* of *Idolatry*, *Idolatry* which is *Idolatry*, and *Idolatry* which is *not Idolatry*, like the honest Preacher that talk'd of *three sorts* of *Seekers*, one that sought and found, another who sought and did not find, and a third which neither sought nor found; the *first Idolatry* may belong to the *Heathens*; and the second, the *no Idolatry*, to the *Papists*.

And now we shall leave it to the Judgment of this worthy Company to consider, how clear and evident you have made it, that you had such just Cause to separate from the *whole Church*, as to excuse you from *formal* or Criminal *Schism*.

FINIS

TRINITY COLLEGE LIBRARY CAMBRIDGE

Imprimatur.

Martii 3. 1656.

GUIL. NEEDHAM.